

**REMARKS**

As requested, claims 22 and 23 have been canceled from the present application, reserving the right to file a divisional application directed thereto.

Examiner Kovacs has rejected the originally filed claims 1-17 of the present application. For the reasons which follow, applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of the Examiner. The applicants do, however, wish to extend appreciation to Examiner Kovacs for the quite detailed review of the claims of the present invention leading to the finding of patentable subject matter of the originally filed claims of the present application and an indication of the allowability of claims 18-21 if rewritten.

Claim 18 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of claim 1 from which it directly depended. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 18-21 are in condition for allowance for the reasons previously recognized by the Examiner. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of claim 1 from which it directly depended. It should be appreciated that the pair of elongated hollow square tubing 16 of Meyer is not in any way pivotably mounted to the first or second mower as recited in claim 2 as originally filed and in claim 27 as added. Furthermore, Doerflinger also suffers from the same deficiency and thus does not suggest the modification to Meyer necessary to arrive at the recitations of claim 2 as originally filed and claim 27 as added. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 2 has been overcome and that claims 2 and 27 and the claims which depend therefrom are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner identify what is contended to be the rear axis recited in claim 3, the rear link recited in claim 4, the mounting brackets recited in claims 9 and 13, the pivotal arrangement of claims 11 and 12, or the indicator of claim 17, as the undersigned was unable to locate any corresponding structure. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of each of these claims has been overcome for these separate and independent reasons. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Meyer does not suggest that the pair of elongated hollow square tubing 16 of Meyer could include a carrier in a manner as recited in claim 16 as originally filed. Furthermore, Doerflinger does not provide any suggestion of the modifications

necessary for Meyer to meet the recitations of claim 16 as originally filed. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 16 has been overcome for this separate and independent reason. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Similarly, claim 25 has been added directed to the fuel tank carried by the mid link to which the third mower is pivotally mounted. It is respectfully submitted that claim 25 and the claims which depend therefrom are in condition for allowance for the same and similar reasons as set forth for claim 16. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Further, claim 26 has been added further defining the present invention in a manner to distinguish over the prior art. In particular, the front ends of the pair of elongated hollow square tubing of Mayer are pivotally mounted to the center drawbar 2 about rotational axes and specifically not in a manner as recited in claim 26. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 26 is in condition for allowance for this separate and independent reason. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

It should be appreciated that Doerflinger does not in any way selectively physically restrain pivotable mounted as recited in claim 16 as originally filed and claim 1 as amended. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 as amended and claim 16 as filed has been overcome for this separate and independent reason. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Also, it should be appreciated that Meyer and Doerflinger do not in any way suggest the pins recited in claim 14 as originally filed or the recitations of claim 24 as added. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 14 as filed has been overcome and that claims 14 and 24 and the claims which depend therefrom are in condition for allowance for this separate and independent reason. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. .

The Examiner has cited the United States patents listed in NOTICE OF REFERENCES CITED as C-E and indicated consideration of the United States patents cited by applicants. By the lack of application of these references and others like them within the classes or subclasses searched, the Examiner apparently recognizes the clear patentability of the present invention over any of these references.

Therefore, since the claims of the present application have been shown to include limitations directed to the features of applicants' towable rotary mowing apparatus which are neither shown, described, taught, nor alluded to in any of the references cited by the Examiner

and by the applicants, whether those references are taken singly or in any combination, the Examiner is requested to allow claims 1-21 and 24-29, as amended, of the present application and to pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven A. Burke et al.



Dated: April 6, 2005.

Alan D. Kamrath, Reg. No. 28,227  
NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.  
Attorneys for Applicants  
900 Second Avenue South  
Suite 820 International Centre  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Tel: (612) 392-7306  
Fax: (612) 349-6556